

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 have been presented for examination. By the Office Action dated 9 September 2004, Claims 1-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ismael (US 6,134,581).

By this response, Claims 3-5, 7-10, 12-16, 19-24 remain unchanged and Claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 17, 18 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-24 are therefore still pending. Given the reasons set forth below, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 USC §102

In response to the rejection of Claim 1 in the Office Action, Applicant respectfully but strongly submits that the cited document, Ismael, does not anticipate Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant's amended Claim 1 recites a network management system for a computer network comprising a first computer system having a network management master-agent process unit installed therein and a plurality of second computer systems, wherein a network management sub-agent process is installed on each of the second computer systems and wherein the second computer systems are different from the first computer system (see description on page 15, lines 32-34 and page 16 line 33 to page 17 line 7). The network management master-agent process unit comprises a first interface being adapted to communicate with a network management software module using a network management protocol format, a second interface being adapted to communicate with the sub-agent processes using an object-oriented interface description language format and a converting unit for converting the network management protocol format to the object-oriented interface description language format and vice versa.

Ismael discloses a generic management framework for a network management system. Management information is modeled as management beans (m-beans), i.e. managed objects. An m-bean is a software abstraction of a resource that is controlled and monitored. The framework further comprises network adaptors (network adaptor servers) which allow access to the managed objects from outside the framework using various network communication protocols.

In Ismael, the managed objects (m-beans) and the converting units (managed object adaptor servers) are part of the framework and are hence installed in the same computer system, for example they are realized by one Java virtual machine (see Ismael col 6, lines 36-42). In particular, it is not disclosed that the m-beans (corresponding to the network management sub-agent processes of the present invention) can be implemented using a different computer system than the computer system used for implementing the managed object adaptor servers (corresponding to the converting unit of the present invention), since the m-beans and the managed object adaptor servers are part of the same framework.

In contrast to Ismael, according to the present invention, the network management master-agent process (and therefore, the converting unit) is installed on a different computer system than the network management sub-agent processes.

Therefore, and in contrast to Ismael, the present invention allows simplified monitoring of distributed applications. While according to Ismael, on each managed computer system there has to be a framework and hence, at least one managed object adaptor server (converting unit), the present invention provides the opportunity of centralized monitoring by the means of a single, centralized single network management master-agent process with one converting unit for all managed computer systems..

This means that according to the present invention, only one converting unit has to be provided for a plurality of managed computer systems. By consequence, the advantages offered by a converting unit which are heightened by using an object-oriented interface description language format can be provided with minor requirements concerning memory and computational resources compared to the case when a framework according to Ismael is installed on each managed computer system. Additionally, since on a managed computer system no converting unit needs to be provided at all, no additional computational resources and memory are necessary on the managed computer systems.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the subject matter of amended Claim 1 is clearly distinguished from what is disclosed by Ismael and thus is allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Ismael.

For reasons analogous to the ones above, independent amended Claims 11 and 17 should also be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Ismael.

Accordingly, dependent Claims 2-10, 12-24 should also be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102 over Ismael since they are dependent on amended Claim 1, amended Claim 11 and amended Claim 17, respectively.

In view of the discussions set forth herein, it is respectfully submitted that the grounds for the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-24 should be found to be in condition for allowance.

Date: 18 November 2004-11-17

Respectfully submitted,



Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Mail Stop 35
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Wendell J. Jones
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 45,961
Telephone No.: (650) 857-7453